L.F. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-01005-CRB

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

K.D. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-01602-CRB

Halligan, Leah v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-02104-CRB

1

- 1	
1	K.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-02650-CRB
2	
3	J.M. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-02689-CRB
4	
5	Dadej, Jakub v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:24-cv-08785-CRB
6	J.P.F. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-
7	03289-CRB
8	J.M. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-
9	03364-CRB
10	Batterson, Vanessa. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-03378-CRB
11	
12	V.M. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-03591-CRB
13	Lugo, Crystal v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al;
14	3:25-cv-03969-CRB
15	Donaldson, Breanna v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,
16	et al; 3:25-cv-03976-CRB
17	S.S. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al; 3:25-cv-04143-CRB
18	
_	

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## 1. INTRODUCTION

On August 22, 2025, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss the claims of the above-listed Plaintiffs on the grounds that Plaintiffs have failed to comply with Pretrial Order ("PTO") No. 10. [Document 3731]. PTO 10 establishes procedures and deadlines related to the production of Plaintiff Fact Sheets [Document 348].

### II. ARGUMENT

A. Plaintiffs Jakub Dadej, Vanessa Batterson, V.M., Crystal Lugo, Breanna Donaldson, and S.S. are in full compliance with PTO 10.

Plaintiffs Jakub Dadej, Vanessa Batterson, V.M, Crystal Lugo, Breanna Donaldson, and

Defendants' Motion. These cases should therefore be removed from consideration of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

B. Plaintiffs Leah Halligan and J.M. (3133) should not be dismissed, as they

S.S. have now fully complied with PTO 10 by providing the missing documents identified in

B. Plaintiffs Leah Halligan and J.M. (3133) should not be dismissed, as they previously provided the authorizations Defendants contend are missing, and Defendants never notified them of the alleged deficiencies.

Defendants state in their motion that Plaintiffs Leah Halligan and J.M. (3133) have failed to produce required record release authorizations. However, the deficiency notices that Defendants issued on these two plaintiffs did not state that a release was missing. In fact, both Leah Halligan and J.M. (3133) had previously submitted record release authorizations through MDL Centrality. Thus, Defendants' error is twofold; Defendants failed to identify and obtain the releases that these plaintiffs submitted pursuant to PTO 10, and, even if these plaintiffs had failed to provide releases, Defendants failed to issue a deficiency notice to that effect. Without notice, Plaintiffs did not have the opportunity to cure the alleged deficiencies before Defendants filed their motion Therefore, these two cases should never have been included in Defendants' Motion and should not be dismissed.

C. Counsel is undertaking extensive efforts to bring Plaintiffs H.L., A.T., I.A., L.F., K.D., K.B., J.P.F., and J.M. (3298) into full compliance with PTO 10.

Counsel has diligently attempted to produce all of the required discovery documents for Plaintiffs H.L., A.T., I.A., L.F., K.D., K.B., J.P.F., and J.M. (3298). Unfortunately, as the Court is aware, a Plaintiff may become unavailable for various reasons as litigation progresses. Counsel has utilized extensive efforts to reach each of these Plaintiffs, predating the filing of Defendant's motion. Counsel will continue these efforts and will provide the missing documents for these plaintiffs immediately upon receipt. Plaintiffs' Counsel respectfully request that this Court deny Defendants' Motion as to these plaintiffs and allow additional time for Counsel to re-connect with these clients and obtain the required documents. This relief is

4

7

10

9

12

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

particularly warranted in light of Defendants' failure to meet and confer as noted below.

# D. Defendants' failure to meet and confer with Plaintiffs independently warrants denial of its Motion to Dismiss.

Local Rule 37-1 requires Counsel to meet and confer in good faith before bringing a discovery motion. L. R. 37-1. Defendants' counsel failed to meet and confer with counsel for Plaintiffs Leah Halligan and J.M. (3133) about their alleged failure to comply with PTO 10 before filing this Motion to Dismiss, contrary to this Court's Local Rules. This failure independently warrants denial of Defendants' motion as to these Plaintiffs.

#### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court deny Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

Dated: September 4, 2025

Respectfully Submitted by:

/s/ Rachel Abrams

Rachel B. Abrams (Bar #209316) Adam B. Wolf (Cal Bar No. 215914) Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise 555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820 San Francisco, CA 94111

Ph: 415-766-3544 Fax: (415) 840-9435

Email: rabrams@peifferwolf.com awolf@peifferwolf.com

Tiffany R. Ellis (*Admitted PHV*) Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise

15 E. Baltimore Ave. Detroit, MI 48202 Ph: (313) 210-1559 Fax: (415) 840-9435

Email: tellis@peifferwolf.com

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that, on September 4, 2025, I electronically filed the following with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System, which will send notification of such filing via electronic mail to all counsel of record as maintained in the CM/ECF electronic system.

Dated: September 4, 2025 Respectfully Submitted by:

/s/ Rachel Abrams
Rachel B. Abrams (Bar #209316)
Adam B. Wolf (Cal Bar No. 215914)
Peiffer Wolf Carr
Kane Conway & Wise, LLP
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820
San Francisco, CA 94111
Ph: 415-766-3544

Fax: (415) 840-9435 Email: rabrams@peifferwolf.com awolf@peifferwolf.com

Tiffany R. Ellis (*Admitted PHV*) **Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise, LLP**15 E. Baltimore Ave.
Detroit, MI 48202
Ph: (313) 210-1559

Fax: (415) 840-9435 Email: tellis@peifferwolf.com